

Eugenics is the science which deals with all influences that improve the inborn qualities of a race; also with those that develop them to the utmost advantage.—SIR FRANCIS GALTON (1904)

The Eugenics Review

EDITORIAL OFFICES: THE EUGENICS SOCIETY · 69 ECCLESTON SQUARE · LONDON · SW1 · VICTORIA 2091

Editor for the Society : Mrs. K. Hodson

NOTES OF THE QUARTER

FAITH IN THE FUTURE

THOSE INTERESTED IN eugenics, like those responsible for forests, are people with a faith in the future and therefore a duty towards it. Without that faith our present interests are barren and our actions useless. We know that genetic phenomena permeate human affairs from history to sociology and from ethnology to medicine. We are all too well aware of the present population explosion—its causes and progress more accurately than its later repercussions. We likewise must surely recognize—as Medawar expressed it in his Reith lectures—that “all the people alive 100 years from now will be our descendants, but not all of us will be their ancestors.” That means that our present worldwide genetic diversity, operating through differential birth rates, will determine the yet unknowable genetic spectrum of the future people of the world. To revert to the analogy of forestry, what we plant to-day determines the quality of the mature forest a century hence. We have faith in the future yet recognize that faith can scarcely be well-founded without appropriate action to-day—fundamentally in education of the public in the recognition of genetic facts. That is why the *Society's* interest in education must always run in parallel with its activities in research.

We may with profit remind ourselves of the wise words recently spoken by Sir Cyril Hinshel-

wood in connection with the Royal Society's tercentenary:

Extrapolation of history is impossible, perhaps in principle, certainly in practice. The equations of the present allow three possible types of solution for the future. Decline and catastrophe have been predicted on one ground or another, in spite of science, by overpopulation and starvation, or, through the agency of science, by wholesale destruction in nuclear warfare. Continued and accelerated progress have been confidently foretold, the curve sweeping upward faster and faster as each advance in knowledge multiplies the possibilities of further discovery, and as man more consciously assumes control of his own further evolution. Between lies the third and less-spectacular solution, that the curve will level out or gently undulate. But the equations are insoluble, at least by any means we know. The uncertainty afflicts and inhibits some people; but their timidity is scarcely justified or useful. There has seldom, if ever, in the world's history been a time when existence was not in some degree precarious, yet the right response to danger lies in action. Faith in the future has indeed a very great survival value. The better equipped are certainly more likely to survive than the worse equipped, and not only to save themselves but also to save others.

There lies the importance of eugenics.

RESEARCH, PROPAGANDA AND EDUCATION

THIS TOPIC MIGHT equally have been entitled “Knowledge and responsibility”, for it deals with the interaction of awareness and social duty. This topic, too, most certainly must be near the centre of the Eugenics Society's corporate thought and activity.

The process of research we all understand; it is the labour of acquiring new facts, new glosses, new interpretations, which may be piled upon what was available before. We recognize that in

the realms of physical and of biological sciences much research is of an analytical nature, the new array of detail dominating the activity. We further recognize that synthesis, an aspect of creation, takes place at intervals, a new truth or a new understanding emerging like a volcanic island in a growing sea of detailed knowledge.

The analytical phase of research often carries no direct responsibility. On the other hand synthesis commonly carries immediate implications in the realms of responsibility, social or otherwise. To the extent that felt responsibility (more particularly for people) is the real burden in life, analytical research often has an ease which is denied to those who synthesize.

True that synthesis cannot occur without a preceding phase of analysis, yet the two do not follow in regular sequence within any particular discipline or area of thought or interest. Both proceed in practice together. It is for that reason that one cannot defer responsibility, based on synthesis, until after the arrival of a day when analysis shall be complete. In life things just do not work like that. Responsibility becomes increasingly felt as synthesis and resynthesis proceed on a continuing basis of increasing fragments of new knowledge sprung from analytical research.

To come down to earth, and near at home, responsibility for man's genetic future becomes increasingly felt as analysis—research in human genetics—proceeds. To-day's synthesis may have to be modified in the light of further new knowledge, but there will never arrive a day when detailed knowledge of human genetics is such that the final synthesis can be made, the full burden of responsibility received, and action started as may be thereby dictated.

In real life research in human genetics proceeds continuously; synthesis proceeds if not continuously at any rate in frequent bursts; responsibility for mankind's genetic future becomes progressively more obvious; and ameliorative action is increasingly desirable if not yet demanded. That is the real life picture of what is occurring to-day.

The next stage, in the presence of felt responsibility, is the transmission of thought and understanding and intention to others as precursors for joint action of whatever nature. But

the process of transmission may have two aspects, propaganda and education. While not completely separable they are, in the main, different from one another. Propaganda is like a telegram: action is usually and bluntly demanded without any studied attempt to array the evidence. Education convinces by the actual array of evidence. Propaganda, because of war-time use and an excess of advertising in our days, has now become suspect in the minds of very many. In a period when, by immense effort, our population becomes progressively more educated, propaganda and that which is thought to be propaganda, carries little conviction with the real leaders of opinion.

Education is now what matters—education with the objective of stimulating a wider wisdom and understanding than are common to-day—education that shall lead to sensible action, social, legislative or otherwise. This is roughly the position of our *Society* to-day. Educational activity is the proximal objective so that people may realize their growing social responsibility in the light of research into human genetics and related topics. There is full recognition that such education is difficult because of the inherent complexity of the subject, on top of which comes the problem of frequent irrational and emotional resistance to understanding.

Part, of course, of the resistance to understanding springs from the very fact of our modern aura of benevolence, and admirable thoughtfulness for others, which have procured the Welfare State. Because we wish to provide equality of opportunity for all to develop to the full the capacities with which they are endowed, many have foolishly assumed a near equality of capacity. That false assumption is the basis of the environmentalist thinking which besets us to-day, in education and in much else besides.

Educational activity, largely by the written word, must then lead on to eugenic action, which means the procurement of desirable numerical differentials in reproduction. That is the essential core of all eugenic effort. Differential reproduction is inevitable as between populations and within populations; differential reproduction goes on continuously; differential reproduction becomes of increasing importance in this precarious time of population explosion. The core of

our *Society's* work is to educate and to lead so that gradually differential reproduction may come to be eugenic in nature.

THE FEVERSHAM REPORT

A CORRESPONDENT WRITES: The Departmental Committee, set up in September 1958 under the Chairmanship of Lord Feversham to inquire into the subject of human artificial insemination took immense pains over its task. Its Report,* as is happily the rule with Governmental Reports in this country, shows what a vast amount of evidence has been taken and sifted by the Committee. Written in impeccable style, it is closely reasoned and in it the Committee's conclusions are lucidly presented. For much of this, credit is due to the efficiency and literary grace of the Committee's Secretaries, Mr. R. F. W. Shuffrey and Mr. J. T. Hunter.

The Committee comprised members of both Houses of Parliament, members of the medical and legal professions and representatives of the lay public, all highly reputable persons it is true, but there is no very clear indication as to how they were chosen or as to whether they had, or could have had, any special knowledge of the subject. But this is not necessarily to criticize the constitution of the Committee whose function was judicial: to receive and weigh the evidence with, so far as possible, open minds.

Evidence, both oral and written, was taken from a great many sources: from the Royal Colleges, the Churches, the Law, the Marriage Guidance Council, Mothers' Unions, the A.I.D. Investigation Council, an autonomous body set up by the Eugenics Society, health authorities, veterinary officers, doctors of all kinds (including all those who could be traced who had carried out A.I.D. in this country), government departments at home and abroad, and many individuals in their capacity as private citizens. Oddly enough, one important group of witnesses was not called, those without whom the very notion of A.I. would never have been mooted: the barren couples who want children and cannot have them. The views and experiences of this

group are obviously of first importance in this connection, and what is more, such witnesses would have been forthcoming.

The Committee's terms of reference were narrow and may be quoted in full:

To enquire into the existing practice of human artificial insemination and its legal consequences and to consider whether, taking account of the interests of individuals involved and of society as a whole, any change in the law is necessary or desirable.

The fact that a mere fifteen pages of the Report are given to a consideration of the actual practice of A.I. with its past, present and possible future developments lays emphasis on the small size of the problem. No less than ten pages are devoted to its legal contingencies.

There seems no doubt that a child conceived as a result of A.I.D. is, in law, illegitimate. Nevertheless, until disproved, the paternity of a husband who has had access to his wife, is presumed, and unless such access has been denied to him during the time that A.I.D. was being carried out, his paternity would be almost incapable of disproof.

In this country no court has yet been called upon to decide the legitimacy or otherwise of a child believed to have been conceived as a result of A.I.D., but the report stresses the fact that the trio concerned, the doctor and the couple, are wilfully deceiving others, perhaps especially the child, if the birth is registered in the husband's name. Some would take a less severe view, bearing in mind that, when normal marital relations are taking place, a husband may genuinely hope and believe that the child conceived is his own. The reluctance of doctors to accept a couple for A.I.D. unless marital intercourse is satisfactory is mentioned more than once in the Report, as is the corollary that A.I.D. should never be used as a means of salvaging an unsatisfactory marriage.

In this connection, it is curious to note that the fact that A.I.H. is used not uncommonly in cases of impotence (where the marital relationship cannot be regarded as satisfactory) does not prevent the Committee's acceptance of A.I.H. as a harmless and ethical therapeutic procedure.

The possibility that A.I.D. might be regarded in the light of a "conspiracy" and as such, a criminal offence is mentioned in the Report, but no such case has ever arisen in this country.

* Home Office. *Report of the Departmental Committee on Human Artificial Insemination*. Cmnd. 1105. 1960. H.M.S.O. Pp. vi + 98. Price 5s. 6d.

The proposal most likely to meet with general acceptance is that artificial insemination by donor of a wife without the consent of her husband should be made a new ground for divorce or judicial separation.

Turning to the Committee's views and recommendations the reader will be aware of the strong prejudice felt by most of its members against A.I.D. Though there is no suggestion that it should be made a criminal offence, neither is it to be encouraged. It is a nasty business, a potential danger to the institution of marriage, to the couple who practise it, to the child so conceived, to the donor and indeed to society as a whole. There is of course, no evidence to support such beliefs and the fact that A.I.D. is no great matter and can never become one, though noticed at the beginning of the Report, becomes overlaid by legal and ethical scruples. One cannot escape the feeling that the Committee prefer the familiarity of old-fashioned sexual irregularities to the new-fangled and disturbing notion of A.I.D.

Over the many thousand illegitimate births of unwanted children that occur annually, let shoulders be shrugged. Better the devil we know than the devil we don't even though it prove to be no more than the birth of a few much wanted children conceived as a result of A.I.D. A more enlightened view is taken in the memorandum of dissent by Mrs. Peggy Jay and Mr. John Ross which merits careful reading. These two find themselves unable to agree with the conclusion that a child born as a result of A.I.D. to which the husband of the mother has consented, should remain illegitimate. They further recommend that "for the purposes of registration of birth of such a child the husband should be deemed to be the father of the child."

SPECIAL-PROBLEM BIRTH CONTROL
IN THE NOTES of the Quarter in our last issue (October, 1960, page 129) we referred to a grant through the Oliver Bird Trust in support of a Special-Problem Birth Control Clinic in Newcastle upon Tyne. This work is under the direction of Mrs. Mary Peberdy, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., who is a Fellow of the Eugenics Society. The investigation continues, but we have received an interim report from Dr. Peberdy.

Dr. Mary Peberdy writes: The very poor who are very fertile are those to whom the safer methods of contraception would apparently bring the greatest benefit. Unfortunately these same people seem to be those who are most reluctant to make use of the normally existing birth control services.

In January 1959 a research survey was opened in Newcastle upon Tyne offering a service to these people. This was new both in so much as it offered advice and supplies free of charge and that the service was given not only at a clinic but also in the patients' own homes, if so preferred. By ruling out the most obvious disincentives to usual methods such as cost and necessity for clinic attendance it was hoped to observe whether these methods could be more successfully administered.

Since this project was primarily intended for research purposes certain conditions were specified. Patients had to be recommended by doctors or health visitors. They had to express a wish for advice to limit their families. They must be of proved fertility with at least four pregnancies within eight years; this was a minimum rate and most cases have far exceeded it, seven pregnancies in eight years being quite usual. They must come from a lower social class; it was confirmed in practice that it was easier to accomplish this by noting the husband's occupation, rather than by the family income; restriction was therefore made to the unemployed, labouring and semi-skilled groups.

These people, burdened by lack of economic resources and high parity, outwardly desirous of limiting their families, are advised on the most suitable methods of contraception acceptable to them. Information as to the reasons for their success or failure with these methods is being collected.

The survey is controlled and financed by the Council for the Investigation of Fertility Control, sponsored by the Oliver Bird Trust. Supplies of contraceptives are being donated by a leading manufacturer. The team undertaking the investigation are all part-time workers and consists of medical officer, nurse, two trained social workers (a man and a woman), secretary, and a psychologist in a consultative capacity. Some time is spent at a clinic session but the greater part is given to visiting patients in their homes, collect-

ing relevant information, advising on methods, and giving supplies.

Referrals of suitable cases have at times been overwhelming. The response from welfare workers has clearly demonstrated the demand for a service which can give free contraceptive advice to the needy, with facilities for home visiting and follow-up care.

It is perhaps worthy of mention here that certain characteristics which one would have expected to find in such people have in fact been noted. The high incidence of physical illness has been striking. This is found not only as actual organic disease but also in the form of general debility, which applies not only to the couple but to the whole family. Our impression is that mental disorder takes the form of character disorder rather than psychotic or neurotic illness.

Results are not yet available. New referrals are still being accepted and no conclusions can as yet be reached even on patients accepted early in the survey. The measure of success, and successes there certainly have been, must all the time be weighed up against the strongest likelihood of early pregnancy if referral had never taken place. Perhaps one of the most hopeful indications is that the most ardent supporters are the patients who have become pregnant once during the survey but are now resolved to succeed.

The middle class couple increasingly expect accurate size and interval family planning. The married woman from the "fertile poor", who has for several years been continuously pregnant or puerperal, may count her blessings in non-conceptual months, each of these months being not only of benefit to the woman but to her family and to society.

FAMILIAL ASPECTS OF MORBIDITY

ANOTHER PROJECT OF considerable eugenic interest, and one whose initial stages were financed by the Eugenics Society, is described on page 225 of this issue of the REVIEW.

Dr. E. V. Kuenssberg and Mr. S. A. Skarloff have given us an interim progress report of a research into familial morbidity carried out among their patients by a group of general practitioners in Edinburgh of whom Dr. Kuenssberg is one. Mr. Skarloff, who was

associated with him in the mechanics of the ingenious filing system which is fully explained in their report, is Lecturer in Public Health and Social Medicine at the Usher Institute, Edinburgh University.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

AS ON FORMER occasions in these Notes, attention is drawn to the annual report *The State of Food and Agriculture 1960* issued by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation.*

Inevitably these annual Reports, however valuable, tend towards a certain sameness. This is so not only in the format but in the array of worthy sentiment and platitude, the repetitious verbosity which is expected but is not essential, and in the all too frequent marks "excluding U.S.S.R." and "excluding Mainland China". It must be hard indeed to escape such reasonable criticism when there is deliberate avoidance of two most awkward inescapable and unwelcome facts.

First there is the avoidance of any reference to the advantages which would immediately accrue if rates of population increase could be lowered. Second there is avoidance of the fact that, for a time at least, agricultural potentialities could more quickly be translated into attainment by the use of force. Thus, that which is so highly desirable and that which is so unwelcome are jointly linked in silence.

The Director-General's Foreword affords the quickest summary. "Although . . . world agricultural production increased less in 1959/60 than in 1958/59 when the expansion was unusually large, the rise of about 2 per cent in 1959/60 remained somewhat ahead of the annual rate of growth of the world's population" at something over 1.6 per cent. These are marginal differences: the major shortfall between availability and need in foodstuffs, some 25 per cent, remains from year to year about the same. There might well be reference to the special point, so often made by Professor R. A. McCance, F.R.S., of Cambridge, that there is a world of difference between "the food man needs" and "the food man thinks he needs".

* Rome, 1960. Pp. vii + 182. Price 10s.

This of course refers most strongly to the lands of affluence and those who are determined to ape their food habits. The theoretical saving for transfer to the needy could be considerable.

Three points from many may claim the attention of a moment. The quite unworldly must wonder at the conjunction of the stated lack of purchasing power of the poor and the alarm occasioned by a fall in prices in world trade in foodstuffs. The world production of newsprint is given as 12.6 million tons. What proportion of the words printed upon the paper in fact is ever read, and by what amount does this production exceed the rational product of the softwood forests of the world? Finally, what are the advantages and disadvantages to humanity in the production and combustion of over half a million tons of tobacco each year?

Such minor ponderings and criticisms must not, however, dim our admiration of the zeal, benevolence and effort which are expended annually by F.A.O. both in the field and in this Report.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF SOCIOLOGY

THE RECENT NINETEENTH International Congress of Sociology (Institut International de Sociologie) held from August 31st to September 7th, 1960 at Mexico City held considerable interest for eugenicists.

Attending the Congress were Executive Members of the International Association for the Advancement of Ethnology and Eugenics: Professors Corrado Gini (President of the Institut International de Sociologie, University of Rome) and Michele Marotta (University of Cagliari). The Secretary of the I.A.A.E.E., A. James Gregor (Washington College, Maryland) officially represented the Association as delegate.

Professor Gini has long been actively associated with the eugenics movement. As early as 1909 he delivered an essay on neo-Malthusianism in Italy ("Risposta all'inchiesta sull'opportunità della propaganda neo-malthusiana in Italia," *Pagine Libere*, 3, 18, September 1909). In 1912 he contributed the article, "Contributi statistici ai problemi dell'Eugenica," to the *Rivista Italiana di Sociologia* (16, May-August 1912), which was followed in rapid succession

by articles on "The Contributions of Demography to Eugenics" (*Problems in Eugenics—Report of Proceedings of the First International Eugenics Congress* [London: 1912-13]) and "Eugenica" (*Rivista Italiana di Sociologia*, 18, 1, January-February 1914). His abiding interest in the problems of eugenics continues to this day.

Professor Marotta is author of the article "Eugenetica," which appeared recently in the *Grande Dizionario Enciclopedico* (U.T.E.T., V: 355-358) and in his recent book, *Società e Uomo in Sardegna* (Cagliari: *Annali economico sociali della Sardegna*, 1958), considerable space was devoted to the problem of differential fertility and the average level of population intelligence.

Consequently, and largely as a result of the known interests of these two professors the Congress although it was a specifically sociological enterprise, considered many problems which fall within the compass of eugenics.

The communication of A. James Gregor dealt with a synoptic, integral theory of race formation ("Sociology and the Anthropobiological Sciences," *Mémoire du XIXe Congrès International de Sociologie*, II [Mexico City: 1960], pp. 83-106) in which the problems of differential fertility natural and artificial selection, homogamy (the disposition of individuals to marry like individuals) and the political and social restrictions on the selection of a marriage partner are considered as essential in the dynamic process of race formation.

The increasing interest in integrating eugenic considerations into a general theory of race formation augurs well for eugenics, as such, and offers the promise of thereby revitalizing physical anthropology which, in the opinion of some, has, of late, given evidence of reducing itself to an arid classificatory discipline with little or no relevance to serious social inquiry.

RACE RELATIONS

ON PAGE 217 we print an article on the history and psychology of race relations by Mr. A. J. Gregor who is an Instructor in the Department of Philosophy at Washington College, Maryland.

Race prejudice is but one form of group consciousness and exclusiveness, and in his argument Mr. Gregor has deliberately followed a somewhat pessimistic line as a counterbalance to what

he considers to be the far too sanguine beliefs prevalent in some quarters to-day, such as, for instance, that racial friction can be dispelled by education in the form of courses in race relations in all schools. In his belief that these problems can only be solved from a realization of their complexity, Mr. Gregor has sought to stress the difficulties of an intensely difficult situation.

The Institut International de Sociologie, whose President is Professor Corrado Gini of the University of Rome, is, we learn, in the process of forming a special section for the study of race prejudice and it is to be hoped that constructive proposals will be forthcoming in the not too distant future. We need to know more of the factors which encourage the persistence of exclusiveness; why, for instance, should there be a comparatively easy assimilation in our own country of immigrants from central Europe and the Mediterranean countries and islands—"foreigners," possibly refugees, whose complexions are far darker than ours and who can scarcely speak our language—as compared with the violent distaste which has occasionally been shown against British nationals of negroid appearance whose mother tongue is English? Another matter for elucidation is the point in a child's life at which exclusiveness appears and whether this is largely due to adult influence and example. Small children may appear to be quite unaffected by differences in skin colour among themselves; is it at adolescence that a repugnance at the thought of intermarriage so often emerges and causes the groups to draw apart?

Many of us know of happy marriages, close friendships and successful co-operation between individuals of very different ethnic and social backgrounds. The world is growing smaller, and more crowded, every year. Only time will show whether race relations improve with education or deteriorate with crowding. Both are likely to occur.

OBITUARY

THE BARON SIMON OF WYTHENSHAW, LL.D., M.I.C.E.

LORD SIMON OF WYTHENSHAW, who died in October of last year, was elected a Life Fellow of the Eugenics Society in 1936 and served on the Council from 1953 to 1956.

Dr. C. P. Blacker writes: I was introduced to Lord Simon eight years ago by Mr. E. M. Nicholson, now Director of the Nature Conservancy and a shrewd judge of people's capacities. He told me that Lord Simon was beginning to take an interest in the world's population problems; and he went on to describe his special gifts.

Lord Simon, Nicholson said, had an almost uncanny perception of events which, at the time, were being neglected but which, in the next few years, everyone would be talking about. Such a topic having been discerned, Lord Simon would then plunge, to the exclusion of almost everything else, into an investigation. He would enlist the help of a carefully selected band of men and women, some of them experts in the central and adjacent subjects, the rest—people of wide general experience whose judgement he respected. A report would be designed and a timetable laid down. An exacting task-master, he would then carry his group along at a fast pace; and there would result a work which, by the time it was published, would be recognized as a valuable original and timely presentation of essential principles. He never abandoned a project to which he set his hand; he saw everything through; and when all was over he would firmly refuse to claim the slightest personal credit.

In about 1952, Lord Simon came to the conclusion that the population explosion was the second most important event in the world—the first being the drift into an all-out nuclear war. I was a member of his chosen band, and I learned much from the experience. Among the most impressive of the lessons was Lord Simon's sometimes ferocious refusal to bother himself over what he held to be academic irrelevancies. Another was the courage with which, during the early stages of the operation, he would ask elementary questions on topics of which he knew nothing. He rather enjoyed parading his layman's ignorance; but there was always a shrewd point in his naïve questions.

Lord Simon has been immensely generous to the International Planned Parenthood Federation (I.P.P.F.). For Mrs. Vera Houghton, its secretary, he had a high opinion, and from this personal valuation the Federation has reaped a harvest of benefits. His success in the world of

business and his flair for picking able people to whom he would depute responsibility had made him rich and gave him leisure. In distributing his money he would be influenced by the quality of the responsible people in the organizations in which he was interested. Having satisfied himself that a movement was in good hands, he would ear-mark his donations for the support of the secretariat. In this respect, he contrasted pleasantly with other donors who, ignoring the fact that a secretariat must exist, reserve their donations for special projects.

What, I have asked myself, were the qualities which made Ernest Simon unique? He had, first, an immense energy and persistence—a refusal to be distracted; he was far-seeing, imaginative and immune from the suggestibility through which most people accept their opinions ready-made; he was remarkably shrewd in his assessments of people, sensing which would give their best if given freest rein—indeed, he was sometimes prepared to depute and trust to a degree that some would think temerarious; he was humorous and kindly and—perhaps most remarkable for a man of his noteworthy attainments—extraordinarily humble. He was totally devoid of both malice and vanity. Physically he was a big, heavily built man, with an expressive face and a warm manner. When pondering a topic his features would take on a contemplative far-away look such as might be seen in someone who was mystically inclined—which Simon was not. This expression usually dissolved in an engaging smile and was followed by a humorous remark.

In May 1954, while serving on the Council of the Eugenics Society, he addressed a Members' Meeting on "Some Aspects of World Population and Food Resources". (THE EUGENICS REVIEW, 46, 2.) In amplified form this impressive statement was reproduced, under the same title, as the ninth of our series of Occasional Papers (1955).

Ernest Simon was a man who inspired not only respect but warm affection—so that his death has struck his many friends with an unusually acute sense of personal loss.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Reverend D. Sherwin Bailey, Ph.D.

Dr. Bailey's paper, given at a Members' Meeting of the Eugenics Society, was printed in the REVIEW for January 1959 (50, 239) under the title "The Lambeth Conference and the Family." A biographical note appeared in the same number. In 1959 Dr. Bailey left the service of the Moral Welfare Council and became Rector of Lyndon and Manton in Rutlandshire.

C. O. Carter, B.A., B.M., M.R.C.P.

Dr. Carter's report on the Eugenics Society's Promising Family Surveys appeared in the REVIEW dated October, 1958 and a biographical note is to be found on page 157 of that issue.

A. James Gregor, B.A., M.A.

Mr. A. James Gregor received his Bachelor of Arts Degree in History, with Distinction, from Columbia University and his Master of Arts Degree in Philosophy from the same institution. He was the recipient of the Ayres-Karling Award in Science from Purdue University (1951), Irwin Edman Scholar and Reader in Philosophy at Columbia University (1958-9). He was Instructor in Social Science from 1952-8 and at present is Instructor in Philosophy at Washington College, Maryland, U.S.A. He is Secretary of the International Association for the Advancement of Ethnology and Eugenics and Member of the International Institute of Sociology as well as author of numerous articles for such publications as *Sociology and Social Research* (Los Angeles), *Genus* (Rome), *Sociologus* (Berlin) and *Mankind Quarterly* (Edinburgh).

Professor G. H. Lathe, M.Sc., M.D., C.M., Ph.D.

Dr. Lathe, who is a Canadian, read biochemistry, physiology and medicine at McGill University. Following the war he was I.C.I. Fellow in Biochemistry at Oxford, and later Research Biochemist at Queen Charlotte's Maternity Hospital. He is best known for his work on the chemical basis of jaundice in newborn infants. Since 1957 he has been Professor of Chemical Pathology at Leeds University.